

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/722,661		11/24/2003	Anton Berns	8535-068-999	7750	
20583	7590	02/17/2006		EXAMINER		
JONES DA			WOITACH, JOSEPH T			
222 EAST 4 NEW YORI		0017	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	-, -, -			1632		
				DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/722,661	BERNS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Joseph T. Woitach	1632	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/23 This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. ice except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 37-88 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 37-88 are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access	vn from consideration. election requirement.	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the orection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
·—,	armior. Note the attached emoc	7.00.017 01 1011117 1 0 102.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies of the certified copies of the priority documents are considered.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a CON of 09/253,818, filed 02/19/1999, now US PAT 6,653,113, which is a CON of 09/116,298, filed 07/15/1998, now ABN, which is a CON of 08/908,348, filed 08/07/1997, now US PAT 5,789,215, which is a CON of 08/700,324, filed 08/08/1996, now ABN, which is a CON of 08/563,138, filed11/27/1995, now ABN, which is a CON of 08/216,121, filed 03/22/1994, now ABN, which is a CON of 07/748,342, filed 08/20/1991, now ABN.

Applicants preliminary amendment filed November 24, 2003 has been received and entered. Claims 1-36 have been cancelled. Claims 37-88 have been added. Claims 37-88 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 37-70, drawn to a modified animal cell or progeny thereof, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- II. Claims 71-88, drawn to a non-human animal comprising a modification in a targetDNA sequence, classified in class 800, subclass 8.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different

Art Unit: 1632

inventions are drawn to materially different products. On may interpret the relationship as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship, since the claimed cells can be obtained from an animal wherein the animal is the intermediate product to the cell. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as an animal model related to the genomic alteration and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the complete search of one group would not be the same nor commensurate in scope with that of the other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: both groups I and II encompass a broad and distinct range of species of animals (see claims 40 and 75 for example), and group I encompasses a broad and distinct range of species of cell types (see claim 42 for example). The search of one species, a mouse for

example, will not identify relevant art regarding other animals. Similarly, search the art for a adrenal medulla cell would not identify relevant art regarding fibroblasts.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, all the claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1632

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Woitach whose telephone number is (571) 272-0739.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached at (571) 272-0735.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group analyst Dianiece Jacobs whose telephone number is (571) 272-0532.

Joseph T. Woitach

Joeh talde